



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/454,740 12/06/99 HILLEBRAND

T 2936.166/00

EXAMINER

NORRIS MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.C.
20 EXCHANGE PLACE
37TH FLOOR
NEW YORK NY 10005

HM12/0606

CHAKRABARTI, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

DATE MAILED:

06/06/01

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/454,740	Applicant(s) Hillebrand et al.
	Examiner Arun Chakrabarti	Art Unit 1655
		
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Period for Reply		
<i>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</i> <i>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</i> <i>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</i> <i>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</i> <i>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</i> 		
Status		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>May 11, 2001</u></i>		
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>This action is FINAL.</i> 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This action is non-final.</i>		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.</i>		
Disposition of Claims		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Claim(s) <u>1-5, 7-11, and 26-29</u></i> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) <i>Of the above, claim(s) _____</i> is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Claim(s) _____</i> is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Claim(s) <u>1-5, 7-11, and 26-29</u></i> is/are rejected.		
7) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Claim(s) _____</i> is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Claims _____</i> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</i>		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.</i>		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved.</i>		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</i>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
13) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).</i>		
a) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>All</i> b) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Some*</i> c) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>None of:</i>		
1. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</i>		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</i>		
3. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</i>		
<i>*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</i>		
14) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).</i>		
Attachment(s)		
15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</i>		
16) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</i>		
17) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____</i>		
18) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____</i>		
19) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</i>		
20) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other: _____</i>		

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on May 11, 2001, for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CAR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/454,740 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Specification

2. Claim 1 has been amended and claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice towards further prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1655

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,948,656) (September 7, 1999) in view of Cleuziat et al. (U.S. Patent 5,824,517) (October 20, 1998) further in view of Nochumson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,325) (September 3, 1996) further in view of Gonsalves et al. (U.S. Patent 5,907,085) (May 25, 1999).

Anderson et al. teach formulations without chaotropic components for isolating nucleic acids (Example I), in particular of DNA, from optional complex starting materials containing:

- a lysis/binding buffer system which contains at least one antichaotropic salt component (Example I, column 15, lines 23-24),
- wash and elution buffers (Example I, column 15, lines 27-32).

Anderson et al. teach the formulations wherein the antichaotropic component is sodium chloride (Example I, column 15, lines 23-24).

Anderson et al. teach the formulations wherein the lysis/binding buffer system contain detergents and additive (Example I, column 15, line 24).

Anderson et al. teach the formulations wherein the detergents are Tris-HCl, EDTA, SDS and triton X-100 (Example I, column 15, lines 24-25).

Anderson et al. teach the formulations wherein the lysis/binding buffer system contains an alcohol (Example I, column 15, lines 25-26).

Anderson et al do not teach the binding of nucleic acid to a substrate.

Art Unit: 1655

Cleuziat et al. teach the binding of nucleic acid to a substrate (Column 5, line 49 to column 6, line 24).

Anderson et al do not teach the complex starting material chosen from the group consisting of compact plant materials, whole blood, tissue, foodstuffs and other sources suspected of containing biological organisms.

Cleuziat et al. teach the complex starting material chosen from the group consisting of compact plant materials, whole blood, tissue, foodstuffs and other sources suspected of containing biological organisms (Column 8, lines 47-54).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute the solid substrate of Cleuziat et al. in the lysing buffer of Anderson et al., since Cleuziat et al. state, "The term solid substrate as used here includes all materials on which a nucleic acid fragment can be immobilized for utilization in diagnostic tests, in affinity chromatography, and in separation processes (Column 5, lines 49-52)". An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute the solid substrate of Cleuziat et al. in the lysing buffer of Anderson et al. in order to achieve the express advantage of a system, as noted by Cleuziat et al, on which a nucleic acid fragment can be immobilized for utilization in diagnostic tests, in affinity chromatography, and in separation processes.

Anderson et al in view of Cleuziat et al do not teach a wash buffer comprising at least 50% ethanol, and a low elution buffer.

Art Unit: 1655

Nochumson et al teach a wash buffer comprising at least 50% ethanol, and a low salt elution buffer.(Column 12, lines 34-58 and Examples 1 and 3, Column 13 and 14 respectively).

Anderson et al in view of Cleuziat et al do not teach the elution buffer comprising Tris-Hcl, TE, and water.

Nochumson et al teach the elution buffer comprising Tris-Hcl, TE, and water (Column 12, lines 34-58).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute the wash and elution buffer of Nochumson et al. in the nucleic acid isolating system of Anderson et al in view of Cleuziat et al since Nochumson et al. state, “It is important to maintain a high enough ionic strength to avoid washing off bound DNA (Column 12, lines 39-41)”. An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute the wash and elution buffer of Nochumson et al. in the nucleic acid isolating system of Anderson et al in view of Cleuziat et al. in order to achieve the express advantage of a buffer system, as noted by Nochumson et al, which avoid washing off bound DNA by the wash buffer and enhances elution at a low ionic strength.

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. do not teach the lysis/binding buffer system containing enzymes in aqueous solution.

Gonsalves et al teach the lysis/binding buffer system containing enzymes in aqueous solution (Example I, column 35, lines 34-36 and Example 12, column 43, lines 43-49).

Art Unit: 1655

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute the proteinase K of Gonsalves et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al., since Gonsalves et al. states, "Samples prepared with proteinase K-treated crude extract have an advantage over others in that hazardous organic solvents, such as phenol and chloroform, are avoided (Column 43, lines 46-49)". An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute the proteinase K of Gonsalves et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al., in order to achieve the express advantage of a system, as noted by Gonsalves et al, which has advantage over others in that hazardous organic solvents, such as phenol and chloroform, are avoided.

5. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,948,656) (September 7, 1999) in view of Cleuziat et al. (U.S. Patent 5,824,517) (October 20, 1998) further in view of Nochumson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,325) (September 3, 1996) further in view of Gonsalves et al. (U.S. Patent 5,907,085) (May 25, 1999) further in view of Summerton et al. (U.S. Patent 6,060,246) (May 9, 2000).

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al. teach the formulations of claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 28-29 as described above

Art Unit: 1655

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. do not teach the formulations wherein the buffer system is a solid formulation stable in storage in reaction vessel ready for use.

Summerton et al teach the formulations wherein the buffer system is a solid formulation stable in storage in reaction vessel ready for use (Column 10, lines 52-57).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute dried buffer of Summerton et al in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al. since Summerton et al. state, "This pH adjustment can be readily carried out as part of the specimen preparation step, simply by incorporating in the specimen receiving container a suitable buffer, preferably in dry form, effective to adjust the specimen to the proper pH for electrostatic capture of polynucleotides (Column 10, lines 52-57)". An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute dried buffer of Summerton et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al., in order to achieve the express advantage of a system, as noted by Summerton et al, which provides effective adjustment of the specimen to the proper pH for electrostatic capture of polynucleotides .

6. Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-11 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,948,656) (September 7, 1999) in view of Cleuziat et al. (U.S. Patent 5,824,517) (October 20, 1998) further in view of Nochumson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,325) (September 3,

Art Unit: 1655

1996) further in view of Gonsalves et al. (U.S. Patent 5,907,085) (May 25, 1999) further in view of Woodard et al. (U.S. Patent 5,650,506) (July 12, 1997).

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. teach the formulations of claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 28-29 as described above

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al. do not teach the formulations wherein all carriers which have a negatively functionalised surface or functionalised surfaces which may be converted to a negative charge potential serve as solid phase and wherein the surface of the carrier is modified by a hydroxyl group.

Woodard et al teach the formulations wherein all carriers which have a negatively functionalised surface or functionalised surfaces which may be converted to a negative charge potential serve as solid phase and wherein the surface of the carrier is modified by a hydroxyl group (Abstract and Column 2, lines 40-57 and column 4, lines 44-54).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the negatively charged surface containing solid phase of Woodard et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al., since Woodard et al. state, "The modified glass fiber membranes of the present invention allows very quick and efficient isolation of DNA from biological samples. They can substantially decrease the time required to process pure DNA from biological samples, compared with currently used

Art Unit: 1655

techniques, and in some cases generate high quantities of pure DNA (Column 4, lines 44-49)".

An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute the negatively charged surface containing solid phase of Woodard et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al., in order to achieve the express advantage of a system, as noted by Woodard et al, which allows very quick and efficient isolation of DNA from biological samples and in some cases generate high quantities of pure DNA .

7. Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,948,656) (September 7, 1999) in view of Cleuziat et al. (U.S. Patent 5,824,517) (October 20, 1998) further in view of Nochumson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,325) (September 3, 1996) further in view of Gonsalves et al. (U.S. Patent 5,907,085) (May 25, 1999) further in view of Asgari et al. (U.S. Patent 5,858,649) (January 12, 1999).

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al. teach the formulations of claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 28-29 as described above.

Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. do not teach the antichaotropic component ammonium chloride.

Asgari et al teach the antichaotropic component ammonium chloride (Column 9, lines 47-50).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute and combine ammonium chloride as a lysing reagent of

Art Unit: 1655

Asgari et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al., since Asgari et al. state, "A preliminary step involving lysis of maternal erythrocytes involving, e.g., with ammonium chloride, can conveniently be used to remove a substantial proportion of these red cells (Column 9, lines 47-50)". An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to substitute the ammonium chloride of Asgari et al. in the nucleic acid isolation method of Anderson et al. in view of Cleuziat et al. further in view of Nochumson et al. further in view of Gonsalves et al. in order to achieve the express advantage of a system, as noted by Asgari et al, which can conveniently be used to remove a substantial proportion of red cells from erythrocytes to selectively purify white blood cells.

Response to Amendment

8. In response to the amendment, the first 103 rejection made in the last office action is hereby withdrawn and is replaced by another 103 rejection.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to all pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 1655

306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7401.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Arun Kr. Chakrabarti

Arun Chakrabarti,

Patent Examiner,

May 24, 2001



JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER